

Amendments to the Drawings:

No amendments are made to the Drawings herein.

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-11, 13 and 15-17 are amended. Entry of the Amendment, and favorable consideration thereof is earnestly requested.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momoncheck (SU 1316881) in view of Rastetter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,463,481), as being unpatentable over Momoncheck in view of Rick (U.S. Patent No. 6,000,489) and as being unpatentable over Momoncheck in view of Nemeth (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,934). Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to reconsider these rejections in view of the above Amendments and the below Remarks.

The present invention, as claimed, is directed to a parking lock for a brake of a vehicle, which parking lock has the form of a unit surrounding a piston rod of a service brake actuator, which parking lock unit comprises an electrically actuated locking means. The parking lock unit comprises a magnetic housing, enclosing an electromagnet and a plurality of jaw members, a portion of the jaw members which contacts the piston rod being moveable in a radial direction in the parking lock unit. The jaw members have grooves on the side turned towards the piston rod, and the piston rod has annular grooves on the outer periphery and in the area for the parking lock unit and/or that the magnetic housing.

Momoncheck discloses a braking chamber which includes a spring applied air released operation for a hand brake mechanism with an additional electromagnetic release. However, as expressly recognized by the Examiner, Momoncheck does not disclose, teach or suggest an electromagnet moving a number of jaws. Applicant respectfully submits that Momoncheck similarly does

not disclose, teach or suggest an electromagnet moving (i) a plurality of jaw members, (ii) with a portion of the jaw members contacting the piston rod being moveable in a radial direction in the parking lock unit, (iii) and/or jaw members having grooves on the side turned towards the piston rod, and the piston rod having annular grooves on the outer periphery, as is required by Claim 1 as amended.

Rastetter et al. discloses a clamping device which includes three clamping jaws guided at an angle in a housing for engaging an axially displaceable load-bearing rod. However, Rastetter et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest in any way a plurality of jaw members having grooves on the side turned towards the piston rod, and the piston rod having annular grooves on the outer periphery. In fact, Rastetter et al. explicitly discloses that the engagement between the piston rod and the bearing faces of the clamping jaws is a frictional engagement, not one created by cooperating grooves.

Rick discloses a shaft lock for an automobile with a steering column, the steering column having a gear rim thereon with teeth on its periphery. However, as is expressly recognized by the Examiner, Rick does not disclose, teach or suggest a plurality of jaw members. Neither does Rick disclose, teach or suggest in any way a plurality of jaw members having grooves on the side turned towards the piston rod, and the piston rod having annular grooves on the outer periphery. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to have modified Rick to include grooves in a plurality of jaw members which cooperate with annular grooves on the steering column, since doing so would cause Rick not to function properly. This is true because Rick is concerned with preventing rotation of the steering column, not longitudinal translation thereof. If the gear teeth on the steering

column were modified to be annular grooves, the teeth would do nothing to prevent rotation of the steering column.

Nemeth discloses a locking device for a linear movement unit which includes two clamping units which pivot about a pivot pin in order to engage a rod. The clamping units are pivoted by axial movement of a piston element with a camming surface that cooperates with the pivoting clamping units. However, applicant respectfully submits that Nemeth does not disclose, teach or suggest a plurality of jaw members. While Nemeth discloses pivoting clamping units, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not understand these elements to comprise "jaw members" as is required by Claim 1. Even if the pivoting clamping units were considered to be "jaw members", however, Applicant respectfully submits that Nemeth certainly does not disclose a plurality of jaw members with a portion of the jaw members contacting the piston rod being moveable in a radial direction. Clearly, the clamping units are not moveable in a radial direction. Moreover, while the piston element may be considered as being moveable in a radial direction, the piston element cannot be considered as being a portion of the jaw members contacting the piston rod, as is required by Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Nemeth does not disclose, teach or suggest in any way a plurality of jaw members having grooves on the side turned towards the piston rod, and the piston rod having annular grooves on the outer periphery.

In view of the above, Applicant notes that each of the prior art references cited by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach or suggest multiple elements of Claim 1, as amended. Applicant also respectfully submits that any combination of the cited references, including a combination of all four references, would not result in the present invention as claimed. None of the references, individually,

discloses, teaches or suggests a plurality of jaw members having grooves on the side turned towards the piston rod, and the piston rod having annular grooves on the outer periphery. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that no hypothetical device resulting from any combination of the references would possess or render obvious these limitations.

Independent Claim 17

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momoncheck in view of Rastetter et al., as being unpatentable over Momoncheck in view of Rick and as being unpatentable over Momoncheck in view of Nemeth. Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to reconsider these rejections in view of the above Amendments and the below Remarks.

Claim 17 requires each of the elements discussed above with respect to Claim 1, and as such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 17 is patentable over the cited references for the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 17 has also been amended to require, among other elements, that the magnetic housing is urged against a domed part by means of a spring, which is acting between a shoulder of the magnetic housing and an outer housing of the parking lock unit, whereby any radial movement of the piston rod, caused by a lever of the brake acting on the piston rod, is taken up by movement between the magnetic housing and the domed part. Applicant respectfully submits that this very precise arrangement is not disclosed, taught or suggested by any of the cited prior art, either individually or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-17, are patentable over the references of record, and earnestly solicits allowance of the same.

Respectfully submitted,



Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr., Reg. No. 33,558
Todd M. Oberdick, Reg. No. 44,268
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06905-5619
(203) 324-6155
Attorneys for Applicant